

LINK:

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	CV 16-01880-BRO (AGRx)	Date	June 15, 2016
-----------------	-------------------------------	-------------	---------------

Title	PETER SONG V. NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC, ET AL.
--------------	--

Present: The Honorable	BEVERLY REID O’CONNELL, United States District Judge
-------------------------------	---

Renee A. Fisher

Not Present

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present

Not Present

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
RE: FAILURE TO PROSECUTE**

Plaintiff Peter Song (“Plaintiff”) initiated this action in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (“Los Angeles Superior Court”) against Nationstar Mortgage, LLC (“Nationstar”), Barrett Daffin Frappier Treder & Weiss, LLP, and N-Cube Investment, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) on January 11, 2016. (Dkt. No. 1-1.) Defendant Nationstar removed the action to this Court on March 18, 2016, invoking the Court’s federal question jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1331. (Dkt. No. 1.) On March 24, 2016, the Court issued an Order setting the Rule 26(f) scheduling conference for June 13, 2016 and requiring the parties to confer on a discovery plan no later than twenty-one days prior to that date. (Dkt. No. 9.) The Court also ordered the parties to file a joint Rule 26(f) Report no later than one week before the Rule 26(f) scheduling conference. (*See id.*) Notwithstanding the Court’s orders, Plaintiff failed to respond to Defendant Nationstar’s counsel’s multiple attempts to contact him to schedule the required discovery conference, (*see* Decl. of Justin D. Balser (Dkt. No. 12-1) ¶¶ 3–5), forcing Defendant Nationstar to file a unilateral Rule 26(f) Report, (*see* Dkt. Nos. 12, 13). Plaintiff also failed to appear at the Rule 26(f) scheduling conference on June 13, 2016.

Given Plaintiff’s failure to participate in this matter, Plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** as to why the Court should not dismiss Plaintiff’s case against Defendants for failure to prosecute. *See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–33 (1962). Plaintiff’s response to this Order must be filed **no later than 4:00 p.m. on Monday, June 29, 2016**. If Plaintiff does not respond to this Order, the Court will dismiss the case against Defendants and close the case in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

:

rf